

This is Issue #3 of Diplomacy Review, the official newsletter of the International Diplomacy Association. The current Editor of the IDA and the current publisher of the DR is John Boyer, 117 Garland Drive, Carlisle, PA 17013. This issue is coming out in October 1972 and covers the upcoming general elections in the International Diplomacy Association.

THE IDA 1972 GENERAL ELECTIONS

This year, we are having elections for several offices of the International Diplomacy Association. The elections have been planned to operate as closely as possible to the methods set up in the Constitution now being ratified. The biggest difference is the lack of time. Consequently, the elections will be held on a faster pace, so to speak, by having two or three more issues of the Diplomacy Review coming out this year. This issue, of course, will be announcing the election plan we are going to use this year.

The election plan being used was proposed by the Editor of the IDA to the IDA Council in the Council Courier, the official Council newsletter. The IDA Council members voted on the plan, and all points were approved. In the end, we received 10 sets of votes out of the total possible 12. Only two Council members failed to vote: Rod Walker and Elliot Lipson.

The IDA Council approved all 15 questions that were posed to them. Thus, it was approved that all dues will be due on the same date as the deadline for the votes in this year's general elections. This is to insure that those voting will return as members of the IDA in the next year. It was also approved that all candidates in this year's elections must pay their next year's dues on or before the deadline date for the closing of acceptance of nominations. It was approved by the Council that an announcement be made in the October issue of the Diplomacy Review concerning the plans made for the elections this year. This is now being carried out. It was approved that the following offices be announced as up for election this year: President, Editor, and all Regional and At-Large Secretaries. It was also approved that the closing date for nominations be on November 10, 1972. The IDA Council approved that nominations be sent to the President and to the Editor of the IDA. Also passed by the Council was the proposal to have November 30, 1972 as the closing date for accepting nominations. This, of course, will also be the date for all prospective candidates to pay their next year's dues. It was also passed that a special December 1972 issue of the Diplomacy Review be published to cover the general elections, and to include a list of all candidates as well as the ballot forms. The Council approved that January 5, 1972 would be the deadline date for all votes, and for the paying of your next year's dues. It was passed that acceptances of nominations be sent to the Vice-President and the Editor of the IDA, and that the three ballots forms be sent to the Ombudsman, and to the Pacific and Central Regional Secretaries. Other points were approved, but they will be covered in the December issue of the Diplomacy Review. Below are the important dates:

November 10, 1972: Nominations are due in the hands of the President and the Editor.

November 30, 1972: Acceptance of nominations are due in the hands of the Vice-President and the Editor. Candidate dues will also be due on this date.

January 5, 1972: This is the deadline for having your votes in the hands of the Ombudsman, and the Central and Pacific Regional Secretaries.

Those nominated will be notified by the Editor and the President. All dues must be paid to the Treasurer of the IDA (Walter Buchanan). It is also possible that a November issue of the Diplomacy Review will be published to cover the ratification of the Constitution. All races are wide open for nominations. Nominate someone and do the IDA a favor! Also, why not help the Treasurer by paying your dues early? The 1973 dues are now \$2.00. Send it now!

IDA COUNCIL MEMBERS' ADDRESSES

It is about time that the Diplomacy Review lists the addresses, especially those who are going to be involved in the upcoming general elections.

President: Lawrence Peery, Box 8416, San Diego, CA 92102

Vice-President/Treasurer: Walter Buchanan, R.R. #3, Lebanon, IN 46052

Ombudsman: Edi Birsan, c/o Pat Verteramo, R.D. 5, Box 6, Bridge Street, Hopewell Jct., NY 12533. This is temporary and will likely revert to his old address.

Editor: John Boyer, 117 Garland Drive, Carlisle, PA 17013

Membership Secretary: Stephen Bell, P.O. Box 1787, Davidson, NC 28036

Atlantic Regional Secretary: Steven Nozik, 356 Kimberly Drive, Rochester, NY 14610

Central Regional Secretary: Lenard Lakofka, 4970 N. Marine Drive, Apt. 525, Chicago, IL 60640

Pacific Regional Secretary: John R. Biehl, 4002 W 32, Vancouver 8, B.C., Canada

Canadian Regional Secretary: Mark Weidmark, 528 Park Crescent, Pickering, Ontario, Canada

Overseas Regional Secretary: Michel Feron, Grand-Place 7, B-4280, Hannut, Belgium

At-Large Secretary: Rod Walker, 4719 Felton St., San Diego, CA 92116

At-Large Secretary: Elliot Lipson, address: HDQS, US Army Materiel Command, ATTN: AMCSA-BC (Maj. Elliot Lipson), Washington, DC 20315

A LETTER TO THE DIPLOMACY REVIEW

The following letter was written by Lew Pulsipher, a member of the International Diplomacy Association. He has some questions to ask, and some constructive criticism.

Where is IDA going? Presumably the officers are well-informed about IDA projects, and they know what their fellow officers think about these projects; but what about the "average member"? Frankly, my impression is that the IDA wants to recruit as many warm bodies as possible in order to say that it represents Dippydom at large, and not TDA or PDC or some other group. But after the person joins, forget him. Is it possible for members outside the officer group, which was constituted some time ago, to really know what IDA is doing and to participate? I fear that the answer is no. Moreover, what does IDA do for its members--what justification is there for IDA's existence?

Let's take the second question first.

Right now, to most members IDA equals the Diplomacy Review. There may be many committees working on various projects, but for now the IDA has nothing to show for it but talk, and little enough of that. While DR has potential to become a unique instrument, right now it is just another genzine. With Hoosier Archives, Graustark, Atlantis, Arena, Impassable, and many other 'zines publishing (and republishing) articles, who needs another? But what should DR be, if not another article-genzine?

Here we come back to the first question. "How to play" and similar articles may be OK for fillers, but shouldn't DR be devoted to informing the IDA members about IDA projects, about activities throughout Dippydom, and especially about new ideas, and the resurrection of old ideas? How about interim reports from the committees, or at least a list of committees and chairmen so that members with strong opinions concerning a project can put their views before a committee? New members apparently cannot become members of present committees, as James Massar related in SPQR. Edi Birsan may have satisfactorily explained the situation to Massar, but the rest of us are still in the dark. How about a forum in DR for discussion of issues raised in committee reports or elsewhere? Larry Peery has the opportunity to waste space expressing pious thoughts and saying very little--do the rest of us have even a fraction of that opportunity?

The condensed minutes of the Chicago meeting and the listing of IDA member's magazines are articles which provide information to the members, and I only wish more of the same had been included in DR #2. But why limit the 'zine listing to the IDA members (and as a digression--why weren't Blood and Iron and Supernova listed, even though I sent John Boyer the necessary information even before he made his special appeal to publishers?)? In "Custom," why not specify which problems have been "judged" by the Ombudsman--which game, which player(s), which GM--so that Birsan's comments can be related to comments in other zines (e.g., Xenogogic). I hope that all instances of intervention by the Ombudsman will be listed, as well. I don't know how other members may feel, but I want to know exactly what IDA is doing. Moreover, I hope IDA will tell me what other groups and individuals in Dippydom are doing, even if they are not affiliated with members of the IDA.

Someone may suggest that the Regional Secretaries should be able to provide information to interested members. I doubt that

(cont. on next page)

the RS's have time to do so, even if they have the information at their disposal. I often wonder why we have RS's at all, since they seem to have little to do, and since such systems have failed again and again in other gaming organizations. I have not even tried to work through my RS--I can't even find out why I never received an issue of his 'zine which carried a postal game I was in (it is now over), nor obtain a replacement for the copy which was presumably lost, nor can I find out what happened to two issues of a magazine I was supposed to receive as part of my IFW membership (my RS is President of IFW). This despite repeated inquiries.

It should be much easier to supply information and discussion through DR than the RS's. Some discussion can also take place in member's 'zines (e.g., Blood and Iron and SPQR), but there is no substitute for discussion before all the members. Will DR be just another article-gemzine, printing the same material, somewhat rewritten, again and again, or will it become a valuable forum for discussion and information about all Diplomacy activities?

Low Pulsipher

WHERE IS THE IDA GOING?

by President Peery

The following is in response to an article that appeared in Low Pulsipher's Blood and Iron several issues ago and which I just received a copy of. I have sent him a response to his personal attacks on me which I have asked him to print. But, in addition to that I felt he raised some good questions about the future course of IDA which I would like to comment on for the benefit of all members.

Low Pulsipher, in a recent issue of Blood and Iron, asked the question: "Where is IDA going?"

In response to that question, I made a number of comments which, after reflection, seem to merit repetition and elaboration here where all the members can see them.

I have been part of the effort to create IDA since the beginning. At the moment I am still apart of that effort. However, the creation of IDA is now a reality and our task is a different, and harder, one. These few words represent some of my feelings about where IDA is going and; where we have been, and where we are now. I hope you will read them with care and then consider your own role in the IDA.

The IDA has gone through the first stage: ORGANIZATION; and is now a reality. We have established some offices and filled them with some officers. This first stage was very hard and took a considerable amount of time, as well as a lot of effort by a lot of people.

Having finished this stage, the IDA is now approaching a second stage: CONSTITUTIONAL RATIFICATION. This stage will make the organization we have set up a formal reality. This is very important to the organization. When this stage is completed, as it will be, I assume, by November 1, we will have a formal structure for the IDA.

The third stage will be the next stage: ELECTIONS under the permanent constitution. Under the Constitution's provisions, we will elect a new President, a new Editor, and new secretaries for the At-Large and Regional Secretary positions. This new election will be very important because it will choose a large number of Council members who will serve for two year terms.

The fourth and fifth stages will come at the conclusion of the elections, although in part they are already in progress: COMMUNICATIONS and PROJECTS. Communications in an organization like this are very important. Our biggest asset is our democracy, but it is also our biggest weakness. Without democracy we have anarchy or dictatorship. We have no direction or we have impelled direction. During the formation of this group, we have had a smattering of both and, frankly, I don't like either. In some cases it was necessary for an individual to take an action (such as call for elections, set them up, etc.) just to get something done. In other cases (such as getting a Handbook project going) there has been little direction and only a drifting attitude among the people concerned. With the proper mixture of Council leadership and democratic expression from the members, we should have, in the future, a good balance of democracy and guided leadership. Finding the balance will not be easy, but it can be done. We have to do it to make this group work. Our group won't just function, it has to be made to function.

An important part of this is maintaining a proper balance between the members, the officers, the Council (as a unit), and, especially, members who are also publishers and gamesmasters. All this will take time. I would suspect that it will be 2 to 3 years before IDA proves itself. Those who want to rush off and tackle massive projects, or who expect overnight results and accomplishments are asking the impossible.

(cont. on next page)

The IDA must be built on the interest of its members. Without that interest nothing will be achieved. That interest must be volunteered, not bought.

The IDA is guided by the Council which consists of some very busy people who have vast responsibilities in their families, their work, their other organizations, their other Diplomacy projects. Each of them only has so much time to devote to the IDA. They can only do so much and do it well. Therefore, if other things are to be done then other members will have to do them. Otherwise, and quite simply, they won't get done.

We face such a prospect with two projects now under consideration. First, the Player's Handbook. Neither the Editor or Vice-President have the time needed to put a Handbook together. Although some preliminary work has been done we still need at least 3 volunteers to handle a good part of this project; one to handle the editing and selection of materials on strategy, one on tactics, and one of Diplomacy. Here are three good projects for three individuals. Are there three people willing to tackle them?

Another project that needs somebody to get it moving is the Replacement Players Registry. This would only need a single person to set the thing up and handle the bookkeeping and record keeping involved. Not a glamorous job, but a useful and valuable one. Is there a volunteer?

It has also been proposed that the Council members have a Diplomacy game among themselves to encourage communication among them. I think it is a good idea. But, we need somebody to publish the game and gamesmaster it. Is there a volunteer?

These are just five possibilities, and I am sure that the chairmen of the committees have more in mind. So, you see, these are the things we must do if we are to achieve anything.

If people want to work, then IDA will be a success and will go far. If people do not work, but merely sit back and talk and criticize then we will not go far. We will, in fact, not go anywhere.

I sincerely hope that members will volunteer for various jobs. Else why did you join?

The IDA is willing to give all it has to its members, but before it can do that, they have to give something of themselves. Have you given your fair share?

Larry Peery

Trifles make perfection, and perfection is no trifle.

--Michelangelo

PROBLEMS AND PROGRESS IN THE IDA COUNCIL by Editor, John Boyer

I thought that I would get my two-bits of words in before I proceeded with the rest of the DR.

After perhaps reading outside criticism in Graustark and elsewhere, and Lew Pulsipher's letter, we all might begin to wonder whether the IDA was worth the trouble. The trouble for you members in joining the IDA and paying your dues, and the trouble we Council members went through to help the IDA become a reality and to function. The fact is that the IDA is run by amateurs, people who are Diplomacy hobbyists. WE are not a professional organization, and we will tend to make mistakes. To err is to be human. Perhaps I have been more guilty of erring than anyone else as I was one of those who said I would be able to work on the Handbook Project. I was also chairman on two committees. But I, nor the others, did not know what to expect in working for the IDA as officers. The fact was that the IDA was a new organization with new ideas as well as new problems for the new officers.

As an officer of the IDA, and a member of the Council, I know what our problems were, and what progress we have made. Larry has made the point that we have gone through the Organization stage. Perhaps we have, but there is still some more organizing to be done.

The Council, for example, was a new sub-organization for its members. We had to work out a system of working together, and until we have perfected such a system, we will tend to be inefficient. Already, we have made some progress in this area of working together, both in communications and in taking action as a Council. Having so many things to undertake in just working together as a Council, we had to neglect the more glamorous goals such as the Handbook Project in order to accomplish the dull, but important work in devising a system of working together.

One step taken in this direction was having a Council Newsletter. We started with two newsletters--one published by Larry Peery, Conciliatory Notes, and the Council Courier published by the Editor, me. Publishing the CC was my attempt to make us work and communicate together on a regular basis. Larry's CN served pretty much the same service. The idea of having a Council 'zine did not take hold at first, but soon we all saw the need for having a newsletter
(cont. on next page)

just to keep ourselves in touch with each other's ideas and work. At first, the CN and the CC were coming out only once every two months, but as we started to accomplish more work, these newsletters had to come out more often. Very recently, the Council Courier was approved to act as the official Council newsletter, and to be funded by IDA money. I have the idea that eventually, the CC will be tri-weekly, especially if the CC was to carry the proposed Council game.

The CC has become, very recently, useful to the Council as an aid in communication of ideas, and in initiating action within the Council. The CC #2 carried the many questions for approval in the election plan. CC #3 included the results of the voting on the election plan (approved). Most important, however, CC #3 included Lakofka's ideas on how to formally initiate Council action through the use of "bills" as the means of documenting your proposals for action. CC #3 included the ballot form for a poll of many bills introduced in CC#3. Among them, a bill was introduced calling for the IDA to sponsor the publication of its own player's handbook. This may in itself seem something like having something too little too late, but the big point of the bill was the financing of the handbook project. Yes, it will take money! This is a delicate matter in the Council, and only a poll of opinions on this bill was asked for. Presumably when we have more information, we will act on it.

So, we are at last beginning to get some results after a long hard year of work. Don't forget, too, that we traveled to Chicago and worked on the Constitution. Now, just now, the results are coming in for the members to see for themselves whether the IDA is indeed worth the trouble to join. We are not full-time workers, and thus I hope you all will understand that it will take time to do a lot of things all at once.

Right now, it is all I can do to publish the DR and the CC without having to worry too much about the Handbook Project or the two committees I chair. There were no previous IDA Editor to tell me what work would be involved. For me, this was a new venture. Consequently, I erred as the Editor of the IDA. For example, I mailed DR#2 third class to save us money. I thought I was doing the right thing, but some people didn't get their DR until a long time after I mailed them. Another error, minor it may be, was not to include a magazine description for Pulsipher's zines. I don't know whether I lost it, or whether I never got anything from him on it, but I will take the time to write one up for

him (see elsewhere).

Overall, I think that the IDA has done a lot, and will do more in the future as it become established. I hope, too, that I have done more good than bad.

Among the many constructive ideas Lew presented, I was most interested in his question or view of what the DR should attempt to be. While it is true that the DR is the official newsletter of the IDA, and as such should keep all members informed of what it is doing, I think that it can also serve as a forum for the members as well as another genzine for the members. Not everyone is a publisher who trades with 80% of all the zines, and consequently, can read articles being reprinted and rewritten. For your dues, you should be able to get some articles of the kind you don't get in the few zines you do get besides the DR.

Thus, I will open the DR to any constructive criticism from the members on this topic of what the DR should attempt to be. If you have any questions regarding play, you can write to Doug Beyerlein, 3934 S.W. Southern, Seattle, WA 98136. He has consented to be our "Question & Answer" man on the playing of the game. He will be forwarding interesting questions to be published in the DR. Edi Birsan will be drawing on his vast knowledge as player to make up Diplomacy quizzes for the members to solve. Yet, the DR is looking for more regular contributors. Are you willing to help?

TALKING ABOUT SANCTIONING by Lenard Lakofka

The IDA is seeking recognition as an important force in organized postal Diplomacy. To meet that need, I suggest we present our credentials in the form of IDA Sanctions.

The IDA should sanction new publications and constantly review old ones. Zines that do not meet a reasonable standard should be announced as a poor risk to the Diplomacy player. The Council should vote on each current and new zine as to dependability, quality of gamesmastering, and reasonable physical appearance. Additional contents of any zine would not involve its sanction.

There would be two classes of IDA sanctions: 1) Recommended zines, 2) Fully accredited zines. Recommended zines would be listed and voted on every 6 to 12 months by the IDA Council. Our obligation to a player is only that of review of the journal. Sanctioned zines would be another story! The person
(cont. on next page)

who wishes a sanction must apply for it. When he is sanctioned, these guarantees come into force:

- If he ceases to publish, for any reason, other IDA sanctioned zines will pick up his games.
- If he ceases to publish, for any reason, he pledges to refund all subscription fees yet outstanding.
- As a sanctioned zine, the publisher pledges to pick up one or two games from any other sanctioned zine that ceases to publish.
- Any sanctioned publisher who does not publish his games for three months, will be given one warning--in writing. If one more month goes by, he will be removed as player in any and all games in which he is a player. If he does not publish, he shall not play!

Why should we seek these sanctions? The demise of Rod Walker is just one recent example of publishers quitting while their players/subscribers are owed, as much as, hundreds of dollars! We have been kind in the past--a few nasty words in the press and that's it. Yet, a person who fails to publish has taken money for a service and not delivered. That is use of the mails to defraud! A person could be sued, taken to small claims court, or prosecuted by his local and/or federal government! It is against the law to steal! The IDA should seek to protect its own by guarantees to the player that his game will go on. Actual legal action is another course of action--but let's not take it yet! ((perhaps I have a wild idea, but what about paying for the sanction? A fee could perhaps not only induce publishers to remain publishing, but also serve as another source of revenue for the IDA!--Ed.))

IDA MEMBERS' PUBLICATIONS

I overlooked giving information on Blood & Iron and Supernova, both published by Lew Pulsipher, but here it is below (I just hope that it is correct).

BLOOD AND IRON. Lew Pulsipher, 329 Twin Towers, Albion, MI 49224. Is devoted to multi-player "conflict simulations," especially Diplomacy variants. Sub: 8/\$1, sample issue 15¢. Apparently has no game openings other than needing 3 players for a game of historical Origins. However, it is possible these positions may be soon filled. There are two Origins games now running, and Lew needs replacement players for both.

SUPERNOVA. Lew Pulsipher, same as above. Apparently, this zine carries variant games

as it has Mordor vs the World (I think), 1969 Raj. There may be openings in ME IV or Third Age. Required fee is the sub plus \$1 game deposit. Inquire first. Sub is 7/\$1, single issue, .15¢. Both this zine and Blood and Iron are reproduced by mimeo. ALPHA. David Hunt, 217 E. Front St., Adrian, MI 49221. Ditto. Tri-weekly. Avg. # of pages: 10-14. NO. Sub 8/\$1.50, SEF/\$1.50 plus \$1.50 upon entrance. Features: articles on fine play, short stories, press releases, contests, etc. including Diplopolitics. This is an old announcement, Dave, do you have any revisions?

HOOSTER ARCHIVES. Walter Buchanan. R.R.#3, Lebanon, IN 46052. Ditto. Now avg. 5-7 pages, plus cover. NO. Sub is 13/\$2.00 or 6/\$1.00. Features the Multiple Winners Invitational Game which includes 7 top players, articles on good play by well-known players and publishers, etc.

That is all I have on hand. It would be a waste of time and space to reprint the ones you already have in DR#2. The other publishers ought to send in their information on their zines. If there are any changes, please let me know!

ANOTHER TREASURER'S REPORT

The financial position of IDA is still improving although membership seems to be leveling off. As of 9 October, we stand financially as follows:

Income

Dues-	\$110.00
Advance Dues-	2.00
Contributions:	
Birsan	5.00
Anonymous	10.00
Buchanan	10.00
Boyer	10.00
Stamp Project-	3.00

\$140.00

Expenses

Elections (last spring)	\$35.00
Conciliatory Notes Fund	5.00
Diplomacy Review Fund	55.00
	<u>\$95.00</u>

Balance: \$55.00

(cont. next page)

In reference to the above, Bob Lamb, Chief of the Commemorative Stamp Money-making Project, deserves a lot of credit for getting the project successfully underway. John Hendry has also joined the Finance Committee to work on this project. Please send all your used commemorative stamps to them for processing.

Bill Jarvis, the Vice-chairman of the Finance Committee, is now heading a drive to solicit contributions from members. Any funds raised will be added to the general treasury and will go for the Handbook Project, etc. Of course, the drive is purely voluntary and low-pressure, so don't feel any obligation to contribute if Bill contacts you. Also remember that by Council resolution, no member can contribute more than \$10.00 per year, and a contribution in any amount is only desired if freely given.

--Walter Buchanan, Treas.

MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRES

by Pacific Regional Secretary,
John Biehl

I am disappointed in some of the results obtained from the questionnaire. The two points are: the long time it took for some members to return them, and the lack of interest in helping on the committees. The few of you who expressed interest in one or more committees should contact the appropriate chairmen to offer your services. I will only give the results of a few questions.

6. What Diplomacy magazines have you played in? Give each one a rating from one to ten, where one is the poorest.

Results: I was not aware that there were so many gamezines on Diplomacy. Forty-one were mentioned in returned questionnaires. Except for a handful, the others were mentioned only once or twice, and as Rod Walker said, "On what basis should they be rated? Those zines which were mentioned often do show consistent ratings.

Erewhon--10,9,8,8 avg. 9

Impassable--10,9,9 avg. 9

Costaguana--9,10,8,9 avg. 9

Adag--7,10,5 avg. 7

Graustark--8,10,1 avg. 6

I hope no ego's were offended or unduly inflated.

10. Would you like to publish a Diplomacy magazine?

Yes--4 No--5 Publisher--4

Results: This is very interesting for roughly one-third already publish, one-third would like to publish while one-third do not

wish to publish a zine.

11. Do you favor a (specify) week schedule for moves?

Two--0 Threoo--10 Four--5

Results: Roughly two-thirds of the members desire a three-week schedule versus one-third who want a four-week schedule. Possibly IDA sponsored games can please both groups by offering the members game schedules at a 2:1 ratio.

15. Are you in favor of campaign messages being printed in the Newsletter, "Diplomacy Review"?

Yes--6 No--5 Debate--2

Results: The members are equally divided on this question. Some members support this question for non-publishers only--a limit on the length of these campaign messages was also expressed.

16. Are you in favor of a "Forum Column" in the newsletter for the members' use (e.g., for questions and short statements)?

Yes--13 No--1

Results: Members are overwhelmingly in support of this question. It is up to the Editor to institute this in the DR.

17. Are you in favor of standardization of Gamesmaster's miscellaneous rules?

Yes--7 No--4 Debate--2

Results: A slim majority of the members support standardization. This subject is very delicate in terms of debating pro's and con's. Most publishers are quite against this question. Rod Walker again puts this question in a nutshell. A standard format as opposed to content may be what most members of IDA want.

Conclusion: If there is a discrepancy in the tally, it is because not everyone answered all the questions.

--John Biehl

((John, would you want to develop a poll for another issue of Diplomacy Review? We can use the DR to mail the one sheet ballots for a poll.--Ed.))

DIPLOMACY REVIEW REPRINTS!

Well, I have another great reprint article from Hoosier Archives written by our newest member, Charles Reinsel, when he was publisher of Big Brother. That was quite some time ago, but now I hear that we will see his return to publishing. Right now, a great article by Charles Reinsel written in the very early days of the hobby. (The three-article series has been slightly edited into one article by Walter Buchanan, (cont. on next page)

the publisher of Hoosier Archives.

STATISTICS OF THE POSTAL DIPLOMACY GAMEBOARD
by Charles Reinsel

The Diplomacy board has a total of 75 spaces to which pieces may move. (A chess board has just 64 spaces.) 56 of these spaces are land provinces, 19 are sea spaces and 14 of the spaces are landlocked and may be entered only by armies. Fleets may go to the 19 sea spaces and 42 of the coastal land areas for a total of 61 spaces. (This is five more than the 56 spaces that armies may move to.) Of the 56 land provinces, 34 are supply centers and 22 are non-supply provinces. Of the 14 spaces that may be reached only by armies, 7 are supply centers and 7 are not.

Country	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
England	6	3	3	0	0	6	5	3.0	3.8
France	6	3	3	2	2	5	8	4.5	2.2
Germany	6	3	3	3	3	6	11	5.2	1.8
Italy	6	3	3	2	0	6	7	3.7	3.5
Austria	6	3	3	3	2	5	10	5.7	0.5
Russia	7	4	3	3	3	6	11	4.4	1.8
Turkey	5	3	2	1	1	5	5	2.8	3.4
Total:	56	34	22	-	-	-	-	-	-
(Neutrals)	14	12	2	-	-	-	-	3.1	3.9
(Sea Spaces)	-	-	19	-	-	-	-	-	6.1

Explanation of the above chart:

A = Total provinces in homeland

B = Number of Supply Centers

C = Non-Supply provinces

D = Borders other Major powers

E = Borders Neutral Supply Centers

F = Homeland border spaces*

G = Foreign spaces along border*

H = Average Mobility of army units**

I = Average Mobility of fleets**

* If F is greater than G, it is a favorable situation. However, if G is greater than F, the border situation is unfavorable. Note Germany which seldom wins a game.

** Mobility is hereby defined as the number of adjoining spaces to which a piece may legally move.

Note that Austria has the greatest land mobility and this is why Austria is the most fun to play. Turkey, of course, has the least land mobility. England, of course, has the greatest sea mobility and Austria the least.

The most important sea space is the North Sea which has a fleet mobility of 11. Close behind are the Mid-Atlantic Ocean and the Ionian Sea which both have a fleet mobility of 9. The weakest sea space with a mobility of only 3 is the Barents Sea. Controlling

the sea spaces with the greatest mobility can win the game.

As far as armies are concerned, the most important spaces are Burgundy, Munich and Galicia. Whoever controls these should win the game. Their mobility ratings are 7. The weakest land spaces are North Africa, Tunis and Portugal with 1 each.

Fleets on a coast fare best in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden where they all have a mobility of 6. The worst fleet positions are Syria, Portugal and the North Coast of St. Petersburg.

When diplomacy fails, there will be wars and certain facts about possible wars are hereby presented. The following abbreviations are used: B.C. = Border Confrontation; A.M. = Average Mobility of Border Pieces; Key = Key for (Blank) to win the war.

Direct Land Wars

Enemies	B.C.	A.M.	Key
Fra-Ger	1-2	7.0-6.0	Belgium
Fra-Ita	1-1	3.5-3.5	Gulf of Lyon
Ger-Aus	2-3	6.5-6.0	Warsaw
Ger-Rus	2-2	4.8-5.0	Baltic & Galicia
Ita-Aus	2-2	4.0-5.3	Adriatic Sea
Aus-Rus	1-2	7.0-5.5	Rumania & Silesia
Rus-Tur	1-1	3.5-3.5	Black Sea

Indirect Land Wars

(Figure here under B.C. means the offensive power in armies or fleets.)

Enemies	B.C.	Need to control
Ger-Ita	1-1	Tyrolia
Aus-Tur	1-1	Serbia & Bulgaria

Naval Wars

(Figure here under B.C. means the offensive power in armies or fleets.)

Enemies	B.C.	Need to control
Eng-Fra	2-1	English Channel
Eng-Ger	2-1	North Sea
Eng-Rus	2-1	Nor & Nwg Sea
Eng-Ita	1-1	Mid-Atlantic
Ita-Tur	1-1 (at best)	Ionian Sea

Note that individual statistics are sometimes pretty bare of meaning, but are needed to program for a computer, for instance. However, they do tell us if it is an even chance or if one side or the other is favored in a certain war situation. Most important is the overall picture you get and the help all of the facts give us during the diplomacy period in deciding who to war with and when. "There will always be wars and rumors of wars," but it helps when you can pick the battleground, the opponent, and the time of battle.

(cont. on next page!)

These statistics should help a country make the above decisions. They help me and I guess that is what counts as I sift through the mounds of facts.

It needs to be noted that among equal players in ability and experience that the single player should always lose to the two. However, outside influences (this is where diplomacy helps!) and, in some of the possible situations on the board, a player who is better or more experienced may hold off two opponents and in some few cases, even lick them both at the same time. In these cases, victory is so sweet!

There are certain positions on the board that cannot be forced except from behind. A pair of examples I've read about are:

England: F Mid H, F Por S F Mid, F NAT S F Mid; Turkey: A Sev S A Ukr, A Ukr S A Gal, A Gal S A Ukr, A Bud S A Gal, A Boh S A Gal, A Tyr S A Boh, F Pie S F Lyo, F Lyo S F Wes, F Wes S F Lyo, and F NAF S F Wes.

Having won two games of postal Diplomacy and drawn another, I, of course, have formed a few opinions as to how the game should be played.

However, now I want to record the basic mobility factors of each of the spaces of the Diplomacy board as my original notes are getting somewhat worn and I have had many requests for this basic list anyway. These abbreviations are used: A (Army) = pertains to the mobility of an Army in said space; F (Fleet) = pertains to the mobility of a Fleet in said space.

<u>England</u>	A F	<u>Italy</u>	A F	<u>Germany</u>	A F
Edi	3 4	Pie	4 3	Kie	5 5
Cly	2 4	Ven	6 3	Ber	4 3
Liv	4 4	Tus	3 4	Pru	4 3
Wal	3 4	Rom	4 3	Ruh	5 0
Lon	2 4	Apu	3 4	Mun	7 0
Yor	4 3	Nap	2 4	Sil	6 0

<u>France</u>	A F	<u>Austria</u>	A F	<u>Turkey</u>	A F
Bre	3 4	Tyr	6 0	Con	3 5
Pic	4 3	Boh	5 0	Ank	3 3
Par	4 0	Gal	7 0	Sny	4 4
Bur	7 0	Vie	5 0	Arm	4 3
Gas	5 3	Bud	5 0	Syr	2 2
Mar	4 3	Tri	6 3		

<u>Russia</u>	A F
Fin	3 3
StP	4 2-N
	3-S
Liv	4 4
War	6 0
Mos	5 0
Ukr	5 0
Sev	4 3

<u>Neutral Non-Supply Centers</u>	A F
NAF	1 3
Alb	3 4

<u>Neutral Supply Centers</u>	A F
Tun	1 4
Por	1 2
Spa	3 3-N
	5-S
Bel	4 4
Hol	3 4
Den	2 6
Nor	3 6
Swe	3 6
Ser	6 0
Rum	6 3
Gre	3 4
Bul	4 3-E
	3-S

<u>High Seas Fleets</u>			
Bar	3	Mid	9
Nwg	6	Lyo	6
Nth	11	Wes	6
Ska	4	Tyr	7
Hel	4	Ion	9
Bal	7	Adr	5
Bot	5	Aeg	6
Eng	8	Eas	4
Iri	5	Bla	6
NAT	5		

For ratings of the average mobility of the armies and fleets of the different nations, see columns "H" and "I" of the first chart.

There were a few conclusions to be noted here. The higher the number of a space, the more important that space is. To win with fleets you must control the North Sea, the Mid-Atlantic, and the Ionian Sea. To win with armies, you must control Burgundy, Munich, and Galicia. Whenever tactics allow a choice, always consider taking the space with the higher mobility factor. Besides, these spaces are easier to defend as well as being in control of larger sectors of the playing board. Too many fleets are useless; however, in the case of England or Turkey and sometimes France or Italy, too, few may be just as bad.

Yes, "Diplomacy" is 50% of winning a game of Diplomacy, but a good player in tactics will be high in ratings! Good luck in your next game.

I have discovered the art of deceiving diplomats. I speak the truth, and they never believe me.

--Di Cavour

THE JOHNNY AWARDS, 1972

These awards were presented at Chicago this past July. The awards were determined by more than twenty-five publishers. Since then, the awards have been taken over by the IDA. Sometime next Summer-Fall, the 1973 Johnny Awards will be decided upon with votes from the membership.

Outstanding performance by a novice player in a single regular Diplomacy game: Walter Buchanan, 1970BN, Graustark.

Outstanding performance by an experienced player in a single regular Diplomacy game: Edi Birsan, 1971BC, Hoosier Archives.

Outstanding Performance by a novice player in a single variant game. No award given.

Outstanding performance by an experienced player in a single variant game. Scott Huddleston, Hypereconomic Diplomacy, Russia. Outstanding regular Diplomacy game: Hoosier Archives, 1971BC, The Grudge Game: Lakofka, Prosnitz, Birsan, Key, Walker, Smytho, Beyerlohn, and Buchanan, GM.

Outstanding variant Diplomacy game: Hypereconomic Diplomacy, Don Miller and Pete Ansoff.

Outstanding performance by a gamesmaster in a single regular Diplomacy game: Walt Buchanan, 1971BC, Hoosier Archives.

Outstanding performance by a gamesmaster in a single variant Diplomacy game: Peter Ansoff, Hypereconomic Diplomacy.

Outstanding performance by an editor in a single regular Diplomacy game: Walt Buchanan, 1971BC, Hoosier Archives.

Outstanding performance by an editor in a single variant Diplomacy game: Peter Ansoff, Hypereconomic Diplomacy, The Siberian.

Outstanding writing of a single press release in a single variant Diplomacy game: Rod

"Will the Real John Beshara Please Stand Up?" Geo. Harter, artist, Rod Walker, Publisher.

Walker, Tales of Barad Durchester, Erehwon. Outstanding writing of a single press release game in regular Diplomacy: Lenard Lakofka, 1970BL, KADATH and Larry Peery, Press Release on Beethoven's 200th, Xenogogic.

Outstanding writing of a series of press releases in a single regular Diplomacy game: Rod Walker, 1971BC, Hoosier Archives.

Outstanding writing of a press release series in a single variant Diplomacy game: Rod Walker, Hypereconomic Diplomacy, American Empire.

Outstanding new regular Diplomacy magazine: Impassable, John Boyer.

Outstanding regular Diplomacy magazine: Hoosier Archives, Walt Buchanan.

Outstanding variant Diplomacy magazine: Bushwacker, Fred Davis, Jr.

Outstanding new variant Diplomacy magazine: Bushwacker, Fred Davis, Jr, and Blood and Iron, Lew Pulsipher.

Outstanding article on regular Diplomacy: Lepanto Opening by Edi Birsan.

Outstanding article on variant Diplomacy: Rick Brooks, Variants.

Outstanding original contribution to regular Diplomacy: Walt Buchanan, The Archives Project.

Outstanding original contribution to variant Diplomacy: Larry Peery, Institute for Diplomatic Studies.

Outstanding backstab in a single regular Diplomacy game: Randy Bytwerk and Robert Ward, 1971EH, Platypus Pie.

Allan Calhauer award for meritorious achievement: John McCallum, The OED Rating System.

John McCallum award for meritorious service: Larry Peery, International Diplomacy Assoc.

Outst. Cover of Diplo. mag: Erehwon 59, Geo. Harter, artist, Rod Walker, Publisher.

DIPLOMACY REVIEW

117 Garland Drive
Carlisle, PA 17013
U.S.A.

TO:

Robert Johnson
Box 134
Whippany, NJ 07981

IDA membership: 111?

Inside: The Election!

Error on pg. 1: Jan. 5, 1973,
not 1972.

FIRST CLASS MAIL

FIRST CLASS MAIL



100th Anniversary of Mail Order

